DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 056 FL 018 379

AUTHOR Chung, Ulric; And Others
TITLE The Computer Assisted Language Learning Outreach Project for Education.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Language Learning Lab.
REPORT NO LLL-T-14-88
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 34p.
AVAILABLE FROM Language Learning Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, G70 Foreign Languages Building, 707 South Mathews, Urbana, IL 61801.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Assisted Instruction; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Internship Programs; *Language Teachers; Outreach Programs; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Summer Programs; Teacher Education Curriculum; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

The Computer Assisted Language Learning Outreach Project for Education (CALLIOPE) was established in 1985 to enhance foreign language instruction in Illinois elementary and secondary schools through inservice teacher education in the form of short workshops, intensive summer institutes, and an internship program. The specific approach is to encourage and facilitate the use of computer technology by foreign language teachers. A description of the program outlines its purpose and approach, inservice program elements, a roundtable conference used for information dissemination, and a brief critical analysis of the program and future directions. Appended materials include a list of workshop dates, locations, staff, and number of attendees from January 1986 through February 1988, a list of topics discussed as part of the summer institute curriculum, a list of 1986 and 1987 summer institute participants and their individual project topics, and a summary of the proceedings of the May 1987 roundtable conference. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED316056

Language Learning Laboratory

LLL

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. LLL-T-14-88
APRIL 1988

The School of Humanities

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

# THE COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING OUTREACH PROJECT FOR EDUCATION

ULRIC CHUNG, RICK TREECE, ROBERT HART and CHIN-CHUAN CHENG

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Chang, C.C.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

LANGUAGE LEARNING LABORATORY
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Technical Report No. LLL-T-14-88

# The Computer Assisted Language Learning Outreach Project for Education

**Ulric Chung**
Visiting Lecturer in Humanities

**Rick Treece**
Visiting Lecturer in Humanities

**Robert Hart**
Assistant Professor of Humanities
Associate Director, Language Learning Laboratory

**Chin-Chuan Cheng**
Professor of Linguistics, Chinese,
and English as an International Language
Director, Language Learning Laboratory

April 1988

Available from: Language Learning Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, G-70 Foreign Languages Building, 707 South Mathews, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

## *CONTENTS*


1.0 CALLIOPE: 1985 - 1988 . . . . . 1

2.0 CALLIOPE: Purpose and Approach . . . . . 1

3.0 Staff . . . . . 2

4.0 Inservice Education . . . . . 2

4.1 Workshops . . . . . 2

4.2 Summer Institutes . . . . . 2

4.3 Internships . . . . . 3

5.0 Roundtable Conference . . . . . 4

6.0 Critical Analysis of the Project and Future Directions . . . . . 4

Appendix A: CALLIOPE Workshops . . . . . 7

Appendix B: CALLIOPE Summer Institute Curriculum . . . . . 10

Appendix C: CALLIOPE Summer Institutes Participants . . . . . 13

Appendix D: CALLIOPE Interns . . . . . 16

Appendix E: Roundtable Conference Minutes . . . . . 17

## 1.0 CALLIOPE: 1985 - 1988

The Computer Assisted Language Learning Outreach Project for Education (CALLIOPE) was established in 1985 in the Language Learning Laboratory (LLL) of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for the purpose of helping elementary and secondary teachers of foreign languages statewide to integrate computer-assisted instruction (CAI) into their teaching. Project CALLIOPE was funded by the State of Illinois, and the University undertook the funding as part of its outreach mission. Unfortunately, because of cuts in the state's education budget, the University has been obliged to cancel CALLIOPE's funding. Although the Language Learning Laboratory will continue some modest outreach efforts, the LLL budget will not permit activities on the scale that had been maintained under CALLIOPE, with as many as five academic staff members devoting all or part of their time to the Project. This report incorporates a summary of those activities into a description of the project, its impact, and prospects for the future.

## 2.0 CALLIOPE: Purpose and Approach

The underlying purpose of Project CALLIOPE is to enhance foreign-language (FL) teaching in Illinois primary and secondary schools. The specific approach is to encourage and facilitate the use of computer technology by FL teachers, who as a group have been left out of the computer revolution in education.

The obstacles to the use of FL CAI can be formidable. The first problem is access to computers, which are often in short supply; those that do exist may be reserved for teachers of mathematics, science, or commercial courses. Money for courseware is hard to acquire, especially given the current budget crisis in education, since it is not an expense for which funds have customarily been budgeted. Regrettably, much of the software itself for FL teaching is crude in design and badly executed. Moreover, the lack of a central clearing-house for courseware information makes it difficult to evaluate software. The quality of the available courseware might lead teachers to want to generate their own on-line lessons, were it not for two large impediments: the fact that few of the authoring systems available facilitate or even allow for FL materials and the fact that few FL teachers have any training at all in CAI or even experience in computer-use in general. The situation is exacerbated by the attitudes of school administrators who, perceiving no connection between computers and foreign languages, often exclude FL teachers from the planning process where computers are concerned. In some cases, even when the computers and courseware exist, scheduling considerations limit their availability.

CALLIOPE's mission has been to come to the aid of FL teachers in the face of these obstacles, through inservice education, information dissemination, consulting, and even software development. One effort which has proven to be especially beneficial has been the establishment of a considerable collection of FL software for microcomputers, spanning a variety of languages, types of computers, and teaching approaches.

## 3.0 Staff

Language Learning Laboratory staff involved with the CALLIOPE project were:

| | |
|---|---|
| C. C. Cheng | Director |
| Ulric Chung | Visiting Lecturer in Humanities |
| Nina Garrett | Research Associate |
| Robert S. Hart | Associate Directory |
| Rick Treece | Visiting Lecturer in Humanities (1986-88) |
| Karen Troup-Phillips | Visiting Lecturer in Humanities (1985-86) |

## 4.0 Inservice Education

CALLIOPE's approach to inservice education has taken three distinct forms: short workshops, intensive summer institutes, and an internship program.

### 4.1 Workshops

During its three years of existence, CALLIOPE has offered some 26 workshops on FL CAI and related topics such as international television and video technology. Varying in length from a few hours to a few days, these workshops have included, when possible, individual hands-on activities using CALLIOPE's courseware library with hardware available at the site and/or provided by CALLIOPE. Many workshops have been sponsored by school districts or individual schools (often as part of an inservice day); others have been sponsored by a regional Educational Service Center. Workshops have also been held at various conferences and professional meetings. Most workshops address a number of related subjects; the following list is illustrative of some of the kinds of topics included: commercial software available, evaluation of FL software, error analysis and feedback, FL word processing, on-line record-keeping, interactive audio, interactive video, authoring systems, and speech synthesis and recognition. An important (and difficult) topic is the integration of CAI into a classroom routine.

Practically speaking, workshops like these can only serve to introduce new concepts to teachers and to expose them to some of the currently available materials. Most teachers need a more intensive introduction to CAI (such as that offered in the summer institutes) in order to integrate CAI into their teaching in a meaningful way. However, for many teachers the workshops did represent their first introduction to computers. By providing this first step, the workshops have served an important and useful function.

Appendix A contains a chronological listing of workshops held.

### 4.2 Summer Institutes

The goal of the two CALLIOPE summer institutes was to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary to personally undertake lesson development and to enable them to function as

resource contacts for other FL teachers in their districts. Institute participants earned graduate credit and received a stipend, including living expenses, while dividing their time between instruction centered on instructional design and programming.

The morning sessions covered design and pedagogical issues. CALLIOPE's software holdings were used frequently to help participants to become familiar with available courseware. The syllabus included topics such as those mentioned in the previous section, but in greater depth than was possible in workshops; additional topics included collection of data for learning histories, computer-managed instruction, artificial intelligence, advanced technologies, graphics, and font and character generation. Whenever possible, hands-on activities were preferred to a straight lecture approach. Appendix B lists the topics covered in the summer institutes.

Afternoons were dedicated to programming. Because all teachers did not have the same type of computer available in their schools, participants could choose between instruction in IBM BASICA or in EnBASIC, an enhanced version of BASIC (for APPLE computers) which provides many display, input, and answer-judging features needed for FL CAI.

All of the programming lesson materials were developed by LLL staff and are specifically oriented to programming FL CAI. Beyond an elementary introduction to computer-use, participants acquire the programming skills necessary to diagnose errors, save items for review, incorporate program- or user-initiated help sequences into their lessons, and write exercise drivers which accept content from data files. We consider these to be the skills needed for a basic level of FL CAI.

Participants were required to complete an independent project, tailored to their individual instructional goals. Most of these projects involved the implementation of a personally designed CAI lesson; some participants elected instead to write a research paper on some topic relating to uses of technology in FL education. Appendix C contains information about the summer institutes, including data on participants and their projects.

Institute participants as a group displayed a great deal of enthusiasm and creativity. Judging from their anonymous evaluations, they found the institutes to be demanding but satisfying. Some of their comments have been captured in a brief documentary video entitled *CALLIOPE 1987*; it was taped during the 1987 summer institute and can be borrowed or purchased from the Language Learning Laboratory.

## 4.3 Internships

CALLIOPE internships were intended to provide teachers who already had some experience and skills in FL CAI with free time and technical support so that they could work independently on a more ambitious individual project. Graduates of the CALLIOPE summer institutes, for example, would be obvious candidates for internships. Terms of the internships were flexible to allow for individual schedules and preferences. Most interns chose to work during the summer, when they could concentrate on programming tasks without interruption; another approach was to work at home during the school year, with occasional brief visits to the LLL to consult.

It had been expected that as all FL teachers became more familiar with the existence of CAI and as larger numbers from among their ranks gained facility in computer use, this component of the

CALLIOPE mission would expand and the use of short workshops would decrease or become more specialized. As it happened, CALLIOPE funding expired before a large number of potential internship candidates evolved. However, the quality of the projects developed with support from the internships is very satisfying. Appendix D contains data on the interns and their projects.

## 5.0 Roundtable Conference

CALLIOPE staff members perceived that dissemination of information and sharing of resources was impeded by the lack of an organization umbrella for educators interested in FL CAI. As a first step towards addressing this problem, the LLL organized the *Roundtable Conference on Resources and Innovations in Foreign Language Education* in May 1987, to establish contact among potentially interested leaders in education in Illinois. In addition to the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association, most of Illinois eighteen regional Educational Service Centers sent representatives. These latter organizations, created as educational resource centers, do not support FL instruction as part of their central mission, but in some cases they do undertake or cooperate in initiatives supporting FL instruction. Among the other conference participants, some classroom FL teachers were included to ensure that the proceedings would address their perceived needs. The conference provided a forum for discussing many issues of mutual interest and paved the way for further cooperative efforts among the institutions and agencies represented.

Detailed minutes of the conference, including information on the participants, are included in Appendix E.

## 6.0 Critical Analysis of the Project and Future Directions

It is questionable whether short workshops are an efficient use of time and resources. Since they were in many cases FL teachers' first exposure to CAI, they undoubtedly performed a useful function. However, many kinds of technical information cannot be presented effectively in the format of a short workshop. Moreover, to our surprise we found that a very small number of our summer institute participants had ever attended one of our workshops; most had become familiar with CALLIOPE through mass mailings. Thus, the value of short workshops as a "recruiting" tool must be seriously doubted in this case.

With CALLIOPE in the background, the need for a statewide organization for teachers interested in FL CAI becomes even more acute. Such an organization would represent an efficient means of disseminating information and stimulating enthusiasm. Such an organization might be evolved from an interest group within the Illinois Computing Educators or from within one of the state organizations of FL teachers--the long-established Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association or the newly formed Illinois Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Above all, it is important to remember that communication should be bi-directional. The CALLIOPE staff has learned much from its contacts with Illinois teachers; these contacts have influenced many decisions regarding LLL research and development projects. In order to provide effective outreach to state FL teachers, LLL staff members take seriously their need to be leaders, to be familiar with the latest developments in technological approaches to FL teaching, so that

they can provide creative, original insights; but outreach efforts will only be successful when programs address a need that is perceived by teachers in the field.

More seriously, it is likely that CALLIOPE's original plan of providing technical expertise to teachers as an isolated commodity is seriously defective. In order to use computer-based instruction with any probability of success, a number of conditions must be satisfied:

1. There must be *hardware support*: Computer hardware must be present, the teacher and students must have sufficient access to them at proper times.

2. There must be *administrative support*: Teachers must receive released time for organizing and administering computer-based activities, particularly in schools (the majority of them) where there are no personnel dedicated to these sorts of scheduling and supervisory tasks. If released time is not possible, teachers at least need to feel that the administration considers the activity significant and worthwhile, and is appreciative of the effort involved -- in short, some recognition or reward must be provided, even if purely symbolic.

3. There must be *software support*: Either the school must have a software library, or a budget to allow teachers to purchase the software that they find useful for their teaching.

4. There must be *peer support*: Implementing computer-based foreign language instruction is a long-term, time-intensive, and technically demanding undertaking. It is difficult to keep going with this kind of activity unless there are other people around to consult about one's problems and plans, generate enthusiasm, sustain motivation, give support, and generally provide a cooperative communal environment. It is a rare person who can sustain an activity in the face of the indifference or hostility of his or her peers.

5. There must be *technical support*: Teachers must be trained about the basics of computer and courseware technology, perhaps learn some programming, and become knowledgable about how to integrate CAI with other coursework.

Unless most or all of these conditions are present, success simply isn't possible.

CALLIOPE was originally conceived to provide only (5) -- technical support -- while leaving all the other conditions to take care of themselves. It became increasingly obvious to us that this was simply not a realistic approach. Many teachers enrolled in our CALLIOPE summer institute became enthusiastic about the possibilities of computers for language teaching. Often they were eager to develop their own courseware and curricula. Back in their own schools, these teachers generally did not (or could not) sustain their interest because the supporting context was not present. In particular, perhaps due to the ongoing budget problems of Illinois education, the money to purchase even minimal amounts of courseware was often lacking. Indeed, to put time and effort into acquiring expertise which cannot be used may be more frustrating and dissatisfying than not acquiring it at all.

This has led us to believe that an outreach program like CALLIOPE must take into account the teacher's entire context and must work to create as much support context as possible. Of course a program like CALLIOPE can do only a limited amount. It can, however, do some things, which are embodied in this revised model for the Institute component:

1. Make a small amount of money (say $200-300) available to each workshop participant for the purchase of courseware. The intent is to remove the most serious, but least intransigent obstacle to using CAI.

2. Require a formal commitment from each institute participant to systematically use the software thus purchased for at least one semester with his/her students. The nature of the use would be specified in the form of a written project plan developed during the course of the Institute as part of the Institute's course work. The intent is to get CAI out of the Institute classroom and into the teacher's school.

3. Require a formal commitment from the teacher's administration to support the project. This should include not only an endorsement of the activity, but some released time so that the teacher can attend project-related meetings, and a promise that teacher and students will have access to the school's computers for an appropriate amount of time. The intent is to give the administration some involvement in the project beyond the pro forma.

4. Make actual implementation of the project in the teacher's classroom a formal part of the Institute course work, without which credit for the Institute would not be forthcoming. Institute personnel would conduct on-site visits to see how the plan is functioning in action. The intent of the follow up is not to do "police action", but to give technical help and a sense that someone cares about what is going on with the project.

5. Create a sense of community and *esprit de corps* among Institute participants by holding two meetings during the project period -- one at mid-course and one near the end -- where participants can talk with one another about common problems. The final session (perhaps part of a larger affair such as a statewide roundtable conference) should involve some fairly formal presentation of each teacher's project: problems, solutions, lessons learned, evaluation, and conclusions. The intent is to create a social context to sustain interest and enthusiasm, and to mitigate the teacher's feeling of working in isolation, as well as lending the project work the prestige which comes with presentation to the larger public.

We were in the process of developing this model at the time the project's funding was cancelled. We believe that this approach would make the project significantly more effective, and we will continue to seek the funding which would allow us to implement it.

## Appendix A: CALLIOPE Workshops

| Date | Sponsor/Event/Site | Staff | Attended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1/17/86 | Andrew Jackson Language Academy<br>Chicago, IL | Chung<br>Garrett<br>Hart<br>Troup-Phillips | 7 |
| 2/27/86 | Champaign Community School District #4<br>1986 Champaign Winter Conference<br>Champaign Central HS & FLB UIUC<br>Champaign-Urbana, IL | Chung<br>Hart<br>Troup-Phillips | 15 |
| 5/28/86 | South Cook County Computer Consortium<br>Thornton Township HS<br>Harvey, IL | Chung<br>Troup-Phillips | 17 |
| 6/10 -<br>6/11/86 | Peoria Central HS<br>Peoria, IL | Chung<br>Garrett<br>Troup-Phillips | 16 |
| 6/28/86 | Eastern Illinois University<br>Charleston, IL | Chung | 10 |
| 7/22/86 | Chicago Public Schools Foreign Language Immersion Week<br>Benito Juarez HS<br>Chicago IL | Chung<br>Hart<br>Troup-Phillips | 100+ |
| 8/4/86 | DuPage - Kane Educational Service Center #4<br>Glen Ellyn, IL | Garrett<br>Troup-Phillips | 9 |
| 10/23/86 | Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association<br>Chicago Board of Education<br>Chicago, IL | Chung<br>Garrett<br>Treece | 40 |
| 10/30 -<br>10/31/86 | Mt. Vernon Teachers' Conference<br>Mt. Vernon HS<br>Mt. Vernon, IL | Chung | 28 |
| 11/5/86 | South Cook County Educational Service Center #7<br>Flossmore HS<br>Flossmore, IL | Chung<br>Treece | 35 |

| Date | Sponsor/Event/Site | Staff | Attended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11/20/86 | Illinois State Gifted Conference<br>Educational Service Center #11<br>Springfield, IL | Chung<br>Treece | 13 |
| 12/3/86 | Mid-Illini Educational Service Center #12<br>Lewiston, IL | Chung<br>Treece | 8 |
| 1/21/87 | Educational Service Center #8<br>Moline HS<br>Moline, IL | Chung<br>Garrett | 8 |
| 2/13/87 | Niles North High School<br>9800 Lawler Avenue<br>Skokie, IL | Garrett<br>Hart<br>Treece | 20 |
| 2/19/87 | Peoria area teachers<br>FLB UIUC<br>Champaign-Urbana, IL | Chung<br>Garrett<br>Treece | 5 |
| 2/27/87 | Glenbard East High School<br>1014 S. Main Street<br>Lombard, IL 60148 | Chung<br>Treece | 15 |
| 3/6/87 | Peoria Area Teachers<br>Dunlap HS<br>Dunlap, IL | Chung<br>Treece | 13 |
| 3/12/87 | K-12 Microcomputer and Technology Conference<br>SIU Carbondale<br>Carbondale, IL | Chung | 3 |
| 5/8/87 | LLL Roundtable Conference<br>Resources and Innovations in Foreign Language Education<br>FLB UIUC<br>Champaign-Urbana, IL | Cheng<br>Chung<br>Hart<br>Treece | 29 |
| 10/10/87 | Illinois Computing Educators' Icebreaker '87<br>The Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy<br>Aurora, Illinois | Chung | 7 |
| 10/19/87 | Educational Service Center #10<br>Channahon, IL | Chung<br>Garrett<br>Hart<br>Treece | 8 |

| Date | Sponsor/Event/Site | Staff | Attended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/29/87 | Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association<br>Bradley University<br>Peoria, IL | Chung<br>Garrett<br>Treece | 35 |
| 11/13/87 | Educational Service Center #5<br>Kickoff With Computers II Conference<br>Holiday Inn Hillside<br>Hillside, IL | Chung | 8 |
| 12/2/87 | Career Night<br>Naperville Community High School<br>Naperville, IL | Chung | 40 |
| 2/5/88 | Knox County Teachers' Institute<br>Galesburg High School<br>Galesburg, IL | Chung | 16 |
| 2/6/88 | Illinois Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages<br>The Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy<br>Aurora, Illinois | Garrett | 25 |

## Appendix B: CALLIOPE Summer Institute Curriculum

The following topics were discussed in the summer institutes. This curriculum is organized by topic and does not reflect the order of presentation.

LANGUAGE & COMPUTERS

- Natural language processing
- Dictionaries
- Multilingual processing
- Machine translation
- Computer-assisted language instruction
- Current research activities
  - Interpretation, pedagogical implementation, research paradigms & designs, types of hypotheses
- Evaluation of courseware
- Gradebooks
- Databases
- Implementing CAI
- Copyright issues
- Programmer's issues
- Technology and pedagogy

COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

- Computer-assisted instruction vs. computer-managed instruction
- Types of student/machine interactions & purposes
  - Inquiry, quiz, presentation, drill, programmed learning, game/simulation
- Pedagogical philosophies & lesson types
- The instructional design process
  - Lesson objective, task analysis, activity design, optimizing
- Types of instructional computer systems
  - Mainframe, micro, networks
- Instructional management functions
  - Roster, routing, usage statistics, learning history data, learning history & optimization, scores vs. analytical history, item selection/generation

HUMAN FACTORING

- Documentation: Off-line, on-line
- Screen design: Menus, icons
- Kinds of student responses
- Error analysis
- Feedback
- Answer markup
- Interactivity & dialogue
- Program control vs. user control

SCREEN DISPLAY

- Text presentation
- Graphics
- Character sets & fonts
- Bilingual display

AUTHORING TOOLS

- Templates
- Drivers
- Authoring systems
- Authoring languages
- Word-processing as an authoring system

TECHNOLOGY: FUTURE TRENDS

- Interactive audio
- CD ROM: digitized sound
- Video
- Interactive video
- Artificial intelligence
- Parsing
- Speech recognition & synthesis

PROGRAMMING

- Hardware vs. software
- IBM & Applesoft DOS
- File management
- Line printing
- Displaying text
- Variables
- Algebraic expressions
- Collection student responses
- Answer judging
- ASCII codes
- Conditional commands
- Branching
- Drills
- Loops
- Arrays
- Counting time
- Buffers
- Sub-routines
- Parameters
- Libraries
- Drivers
- Opening & closing files
- Help routines

WORD PROCESSING

Uses, features, & benefits
File management
Printing
Margins & pagination
Headers
Page numbering
Style sheets
ASCII codes
Spelling checkers
Grammar checkers
Hyphenation
Keystroke redefinition
Materials/test production

## Appendix C: CALLIOPE Summer Institutes Participants

The 1986 Institute was divided into two four-week sessions. Faculty for both sessions was Cheng, Chung, Garrett, Hart, and Troup-Phillips. The first session was devoted to principles of CAI and programming skills. All but two of the fourteen participants in the first session returned for the second session, during which participants developed their individual projects. The names of two auditors, one from the University of Illinois and one from the People's Republic of China, are also included below.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dr. Charles J. Balesi<br>Lake Forest, IL | (Paper) "A Survey and Evaluation of Software & Hardware for Teachers" |
| Debra D. Bell<br>Chicago, IL | |
| Jeanette M. Burkart<br>Decatur, IL | (🍎) *Les Emplois du Subjonctif* (French) |
| Martha A. Campbell<br>Richton Park, IL | |
| MaryFrances Ottaviani Crabtree<br>Wilmette, IL | (IBM/interactive video) *Spots Publicitaires* (French) |
| Linda A. Davis<br>Monticello, IL | (IBM) *French Subjunctive* |
| Donald M. Decker<br>Champaign, IL | (🍎) *German Diction for the High School Student* |
| Hiroyo Nonoyama Demers<br>Urbana, IL | (IBM) *Japanese TE-form Exercises* |
| Hans Peter Dietz<br>Champaign, IL | (🍎) *Deutsch Actuell Supplementary Exercises, Lektion II: the Simple Past* (German) |
| E. Gladys Fowler-Dixon<br>Collinsville, IL | (🍎) *Mots de la Même Famille: "semblable"* (French) |
| Virginia Helderle<br>Peoria, IL | (🍎) *Present Tense Regular Verbs* (French) |
| Michael Mankin<br>UIUC, Urbana, IL | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Marina C. Ruiz<br>Chicago, IL | (🍎) *Cosas de Valor* (joint Spanish project) |
| Xinzhi Wang<br>Shanghai, PRC | |
| Rhonda Weaver Castillo<br>Chicago, IL | (🍎) *Los Colores de la Cabeza* (Spanish) |
| Alice Winburn<br>Lexington, IL | (🍎) *Cosas de Valor* (joint Spanish project) |

The 1987 summer institute was held in one six-week session. Faculty were Cheng, Chung, Garrett, Hart, and Treece. The fourteen participants from Illinois were joined by two auditors from abroad.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dennis Church<br>Collinsville, IL | (🍎) *Spanish Present Tense* |
| Cathy Curtis<br>Peoria, IL | (🍎) *La Poésie du Vingtième Siècle* (French) |
| Iraida Dugan<br>Chicago, IL | (🍎) *Spanimal Game* (Spanish) |
| Walter Frys<br>Chicago, IL | (IBM) *Pronouns* (English) |
| Jim Jacobs<br>Palatine, IL | (🍎) *Spanish Verb Review* |
| Richard Koerner<br>Deerfield, IL | (IBM) *Numéros* (French) |
| Françoise Lecocq<br>Brussels, Belgium | (IBM/interactive video) *Emploi du subjonctif* (French) |
| Jesús Martínez<br>Springfield, IL | (🍎) *Práctica de Vocabulario* (Spanish) |
| Tamela McLane<br>Decatur, IL | (Paper) "Technological Resources for a High School Foreign Language Learning Center" |
| Yue Meng<br>Weifang, PRC | (IBM) *Infinitives and -ing Verbs in English* |

| | |
|---|---|
| Edmund Murphy<br>Western Springs, IL | (Handouts) Spanish Verb Worksheets<br>(🍎) *Spanish Vocabulary Database* |
| Kris Nilsen<br>Hampshire, IL | (Paper) "Authoring Systems -- An Alternative to Programming" |
| Bernard Norcott<br>Urbana, IL | (IBM) *Metaphrasing* (Latin) |
| Victor Palomino<br>Chenoa, IL | (IBM) *Hablamos* (Spanish) |
| Patti Webb<br>Charleston, IL | (🍎) *Conjugaison de Verbes* (French)<br>(🍎) *Tête à Tête* (French) |
| Peg Young<br>Pekin, IL | (🍎) *All About Verbs* (Spanish) |

## Appendix D: CALLIOPE Interns

Spring 1986

| | |
|---|---|
| Lenore Whitman<br>Byron, IL | (●) *Español de la Vida* (Spanish) |

Summer 1987

| | |
|---|---|
| E. Gladys Fowler-Dixon<br>Collinsville, IL | (●) *Le Passé Simple* (French)<br>(●) *Los Verbos Regulares Terminados en -AR* (Spanish) |
| Virginia Helderle<br>Peoria, IL | (●) *UnScramble* (French)<br>(●) *Speaking in the Infinitive* (French) |
| Alice Winburn<br>Lexington, IL | (●) *Present Tense -AR Verbs Practice* (Spanish) |

## Appendix E: Roundtable Conference:

***Resources and Innovations in Foreign Language Education***
**May 8, 1987**

**C. C. Cheng**, Director of the LLL, welcomed nearly thirty participants to the Roundtable Conference on Resources and Innovations in Foreign Language Education in Lucy Ellis Lounge of the Foreign Languages Building shortly after 10:00 and introduced **Edward Sullivan** Associate Director of the University of Illinois School of Humanities. Mr. Sullivan reiterated the welcome and made remarks regarding the University, especially pertaining to foreign languages.

**Edward Sullivan** noted that the School of Humanities administers fifteen academic departments and special units, including large language-teaching departments. The School has encouraged faculty to capitalize on new technologies in teaching the 31 languages which are offered, including Slavic languages, Asian languages, and four African languages. Additionally, tapes are available through the LLL for 52 languages. Counting only the four largest FL departments, enrollment exceeded 12,000 students this year, and registration for next fall would indicate that classes will be full.

Concerning the LLL, Mr. Sullivan made special mention of the PLATO site, the two audio labs, the micro-computer lab, and the satellite-dishes. He emphasized that the LLL combines its service function with a research function, both with its own projects and in cooperation with other faculty.

The CALLIOPE project shows the University's commitment to strengthen language education. Mr. Sullivan expressed the hope that the day's meetings would yield concrete plans for strong alliances among the institutions represented.

**C. C. Cheng** then introduced **Robert Hart**, Associate Director of the LLL, who described the CALLIOPE project.

**Robert Hart** described the CALLIOPE project in some detail, giving special attention to our workshops in the field and Summer Institute program in Urbana. Since it is often difficult for teachers to leave home for a long period, there have been many requests that classes or Summer Institute sessions be held locally. CALLIOPE should explore options for expanding its programs in this way, including the possibility of cooperative arrangements with other institutions or groups.

Some statewide organization of teachers interested in FL CAI would greatly facilitate the work which CALLIOPE is doing. Communication with like-minded people is not only an efficient way to disseminate information, it generates enthusiasm. Furthermore, many issues relating to the introduction of CAI into language teaching (for example, methodological and curricular implications) can best be addressed by language teachers themselves, acting in concert. CALLIOPE should foster communication and organization by providing a means through which

computer-involved teachers in various parts of the state can become aware of one another. A good starting point might be a newsletter.

**C. C. Cheng** introduced the CALLIOPE staff present: **Ulric Chung**, Visiting Lecturer in the Humanities, **Rick Treece**, Visiting Lecturer in the Humanities, and **Carrie May**, LLL receptionist. Then the participants introduced themselves and told a bit about their work and how it related to FL education.

**Cathy Gunn** is a Field Representative (Technology Unit) for Central Illinois ESC 14. She is responsible for staff development for a nine-county region.

**Louise Bassett** is the Technology Specialist for ESC 12. She is in charge of staff development and CAI.

**Bob Druien**, representing ESC 14, is Director of the Foreign Languages Lab of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Western Illinois University. He has been very active in FL education in an part of the state where a large number of FL teachers have FL as only part of their teaching assignment. Mr. Druien has conducted workshops in BASIC.

**Connie Curtin** teaches at University High School in Urbana, where the computer laboratory is equipped not only with Apples but also with IBM machines. Her institution has a strong commitment to CAI materials development, with some lessons available commercially. They have found PILOT to be a more accessible programming language for FL teachers than BASIC is.

**Sue Arbuckle**, representing ESC 13, teaches Spanish at Mahomet-Seymour High School. She is a Ph.D. candidate in Second-Language Acquisition at the University of Illinois. She has conducted workshops in software awareness.

**Arlene Bloom**, the Associate Director of ESC 7 in Flossmore, is responsible for gifted education, reading, language arts, social sciences, the arts, and special projects.

**Mary Alice Crampton** is an intern with ESC 7. She has a personal interest in FL education.

**Christa Garcia** is president of the Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association. She is also FL department chair at Glenbard East High School and has conducted workshops in that area. The IFLTA hosted a CALLIOPE workshop at its last two annual conferences in Chicago.

**Dean Larson** is an assistant superintendent in Libertyville. As an administrator in a small school district, he wears many hats, one of which relates to education technology. In the mid 1960s Libertyville High School had five level-2 language laboratories plus a wireless lab; now, because of lack of interest, only one is in use. Mr. Larson is especially interested in authoring systems and videodisc technology, but because new technologies are more complex and more expensive, few users outside the military can afford them at first; but they monitor conditions and wait for prices to drop. With reference to Robert Hart's remarks about the need for an umbrella organization for FL CAI, Mr. Larson mentioned that the Illinois Computing Educators (ICE) had four special-interest groups and that a group for FL could be envisaged; the first meeting of ICE last year did include FL presentations.

**Sam Ritchie** is the Computer Coordinator at Adlai Stevenson High School. He is interested in FL education and has conducted workshops. He mentioned a programming competition for German students that had quietly died from lack of participation despite having started out well for a couple of years; he made the point that follow-through and a consistent "presence" were essential if a program were to hope to have long-lasting impact. Mr. Ritchie is the president-elect of ICE; he invited the participants to their October 8 convention in Aurora.

**Sharon Pikul**, the Technology Specialist for ESC 10, has a background as an educator (Latin) and as an administrator. She is also the current president of ICE. She identified four types of teachers with reference to CAI:

*Deaf* -- they call computers "dehumanizing";

*Listeners* -- they appreciate the usefulness of the machines, but are merely consumers;

*Musicians* -- they are tinkerers, who like authoring systems;

*Composers* -- they are intent on exploiting the power of the device.

Ms. Pikul recommended a plan covering one to two years, with consecutive inservices every other month; short term approaches are not efficient or effective. She hopes that CAI will help avoid problems of retention which she illustrated.

**Terri von Schaumburg** is the Technical Specialist for ESC 6. She wants to get more involved in FL.

**Ernesto Garcia** teaches Spanish at Libertyville High School, which has a great computer laboratory available to FL teachers. He wants to know how FL teachers can be helped to break the ice and overcome their initial fear of using computers in the classroom.

**Richard Dennis**, Associate Professor of Education, works in the University of Illinois College of Education graduate program for CAI teacher-training, half of whose graduates take jobs in industry rather than in traditional educational institutions. Mr. Dennis, who was associated with CALLIOPE last year, has a background in mathematics and computer science, but his approach in presenting CAI as continuing education is generic, not subject-specific. The College of Education runs five to six programs per year, but has not held one-day workshops since 1980. Mr. Dennis stressed the importance of continuity over a long period, but advised against holding semester-long courses in consecutive semesters. He said they had found that because of teachers' schedules and outside commitments, scheduling continuing-education courses in CAI in consecutive semesters had proven too intensive. Teachers needed time to assimilate the material, get comfortable with it, and just recover. Thus, annual courses seemed to work out best.

With reference to language teachers' being left out of the "computer revolution" in contrast with math and science teachers, Mr. Dennis also noted that there was ironically a recent proposal to have *language* teachers teach programming, instead of science or math teachers. The rationale is that programming is essentially communication, and language teachers are the ones who are expert in teaching communications skills. It is hoped that this approach would lead to so-called "literate programming", i.e. programs which can be read and understood easily by human beings.

**Karla Meese**, Gifted Coordinator for Egyptian ESC 18, takes care of FL in addition to her gifted-education responsibilities. She has established a FL action committee with local high-school teachers in southern Illinois.

**James Wiedman** is the Technological Specialist for ESC 5. He also has conducted many workshops, though none in FL specifically.

**Paul Griffith** has worked for the State Board of Education since 1973. Prior to that he was with the French Department of the University of Illinois. The Board's activities include conducting studies with a view to forming policies, establishing official positions based on these studies, and then implementing plans based on these positions. The implementation phase includes legislation, inservice activities (including the ESCs), and various activities designed to increase public and professional awareness of Board policies: conferences, publications, publicity, etc. Mr. Griffith agreed that FL teachers face difficulties caused by their objective lack of technical knowledge and expertise by comparison with their colleagues in mathematics and science, in addition to problems caused by more emotional issues of "turf". There is also a widespread perception among FL teachers (not always justified) that existing software does not address their problems. Most FL teachers view CAI as a supplemental or remedial or support medium. Because of differences in vocabulary and sequence of presentation of grammar topics, coordination between courseware and basal materials seems to be harder in FL than in other areas. Also, it must be admitted that one can still find on the market courseware containing blatant errors in language and blunders in methodology. Mr. Griffith stated that the State Board of Education has established making FL instruction available to every student in the state, K-12, as a long-range priority. Because the implementation of such a program will seriously tax the resources of the educational complex, in terms of staffing, materials, and resources, CAI should be explored as one means of addressing these challenges.

**Kay Hicks** is the Technology Specialist for ESC 3. She is also in charge of reading instruction, language arts, and FL contacts. She saw a lot of eagerness among FL teachers four to five years ago; but this initial enthusiasm was dampened when teachers saw the abysmal quality of commercially available courseware and realized the hardware and software limitations of CAI at the time. Many teachers are waiting for interactive video with two channels to become available on a practical basis. Ms. Hicks agrees that one-day workshops are pointless, except perhaps for update or networking purposes.

**Russell Ames** is the Director of the Computer Laboratory at University High School in Urbana. The courseware that has been developed there is dominated by FL CAI lessons.

**Mark Myers** is the Assistant Coordinator for the Mid-Illinois Educational Service Center (ESC 15) in Charleston. His interest in FL instruction stems from his experiences with an international school including many foreign students. He described a cooperative scheme whereby a school district and a junior college shared the expense of acquiring computers. The junior college used the machines during the evening. During the day the computer laboratory was available for use by students of the school district, which thus was able to gain outright possession of the machines after two years at only 40% of their cost. Mr. Myers stressed the importance of integrating the technology with the discipline. Our job as facilitators is to see that teachers' reasonable desires are satisfied. In general, however, it does not seem likely that commercial products will really satisfy the broad range of needs perceived by individual FL teachers.

**Luz Whittenbarger** teaches Spanish at Charleston High School.

**Patty Webb** teaches French at Charleston High School. With regard to the problem of reaching state FL teachers via mailings, she noted that teachers receive a great deal of mail and are not always able to sort out what is valuable from the among the junk. Charleston High School has two computer laboratories, one for business and one for mathematics. When the mathematics department gave up its laboratory for next year, FL teachers were systematically and purposefully excluded from participation as plans were made for scheduling the use of the laboratory.

**Delores Decaroli**, representing ESC 9 in Ottawa, teaches at LaSalle-Peru High School, where she continues to use a 23-year-old computer. She remarked on space-management difficulties and hoped that ways could be found to make more funds available to FL teachers for equipment and software purchase.

**C. C. Cheng** described the facilities of the University of Illinois Language Learning Laboratory. The center of the ground floor of the Foreign Languages Building is dominated by an 80-terminal PLATO site, the largest in the world, primarily used for FL CAI. The LLL also has two traditional audio laboratories, under the direction of **Rachel Manwell**. Because of the popularity of mobile tape players like the Walkman, the LLL sells many language tapes to students who use them outside the laboratory itself. We also have a telephone system whereby students can call up a number and automatically hear a tape. Each course has its own line, and tapes are changed according to a schedule corresponding to the syllabus. Recent changes in the University phone service have created some problems in getting these machines to shut off properly when the caller hangs up; we are working to find a solution.

One of the LLL's most popular resources is a microcomputer laboratory containing over thirty machines: Apples, MacIntoshes, IBM PCs, and an IBM 5550 from Japan for handling characters in Asian languages, as well as printers. The LLL's fourth main component is the video and international television laboratory, under the direction of **Junetta Gillespie**. We have twelve playback units, in various formats, as well as two satellite dishes. The fifth main component is the electronics shop, where two full-time technicians work to keep everything running.

Mr. Cheng also mentioned the Kurzweil scanner, which can convert printed documents to ASCII files; it can be "trained" to read various print fonts. The LLL also houses laser printers for use by School of Humanities faculty. These printers are also used for the LLL's own publishing of technical reports, the house journal *Studies in Language Learning*, etc.

At 11:30 participants were taken on a tour of the LLL facilities. The conference then adjourned to the Levis Faculty Center, where the LLL hosted a luncheon.

Shortly before 1:30 p.m. the conference reconvened. **C. C. Cheng** introduced **Fernand Marty**, Professor Emeritus of French, who has worked closely with the LLL on various projects.

**Ernesto Garcia** spoke from the point of view of the FL teacher using CAI. Libertyville High School makes the use of computer facilities available to FL teachers. Nevertheless, more of them, especially the ones at the Butler Lake Building, should take advantage of these opportunities. By doing so, they will expose their students to another way of acquiring knowledge.

Higher level Spanish and French classes at Libertyville utilize commercial courseware to review grammar. Students using CAI have displayed a notable improvement in their composition skills. In some cases, students are enticed to use the computer on their own time by the offer of "extra credit".

For some teachers the educational and practical advantages of CAI are not sufficient to help them see past their vague fear of the unknown. In some cases, all that is necessary is a little personal support and reassurance: "hand-holding".

**Dean Larson** mentioned a valuable resource available for free, which Libertyville's English classes had been using for word-processing by students on Apple computers: *FrEdWriter*; he distributed an excerpt describing it, from the *Proceedings* of the Micro-Ideas conference of February 1986. A Spanish version of *FrEdWriter* is available. **Dick Dennis** remarked that a slight equipment modification, costing about $30, is necessary to get the Spanish accents to display properly on the monitor when using *FrEdWriter*. (The modification is not necessary for printing; for information on ordering the Spanish version, contact Hands-on Training, 4021 Allen School Road, Bonita, CA 92002, or call Al Rogers at (619) 475-4852.)

**Arlene Bloom** described a program she initiated of brown-bag lunches for FL instruction innovations (not necessarily technological): a sort of show-and-tell session. She made suggestions to get a feel for the teachers' perceived inservice needs, which related especially to training in teaching oral proficiency, since many had received preservice training before communicative competence was emphasized. She also mentioned a program which channeled students with high SAT scores into a Latin program; a similar program might be set up to teach Japanese. She referred as well to a program in the south Chicago suburbs for academically talented four-year-olds, who meet 2 1/2 hours a day, three times a week; FL instruction might be considered for 1987-88.

**Paul Griffith** explained the status of FL education in Illinois from the viewpoint of the State Board of Education.

The State Board of Education is currently implementing the education reform legislation passed in 1985. Policy studies leading to this reform were started in 1981, and the Board position was adopted in 1983. The legislation enacted in 1985 represented a compromise among a number of interested groups. The legislation identifies six priority areas (which do not include FL): language arts, social studies, mathematics, science, fine arts, and physical development/health. As a result these six areas are priorities for funding and program development.

One major provision of the reform legislation was to require the State Board to evaluate schooling on the basis of learning outcomes rather than time on task. To this end, the Board has disseminated goals and objectives in each of the six curricular areas, to be used in evaluating instructional programs in local districts at the end of third, sixth, and tenth grades. Districts are required to prepare learning assessment plans based on these outcomes and submit the plans for approval by the State Board. As with any new approach, there have been some misunderstandings; but implementation of the legislation is proceeding on schedule.

Mr. Griffith explained that when the fundamental areas were being identified, physical education, fine arts, and FL were hotly debated areas. The Board concluded that there in fact was sufficient public support to warrant inclusion of fine arts and physical development/health. Although many

Board members also wanted to include FL, they could assess relatively little support for it among the general public, and so they chose to omit FL.

However, the Board did make FL the subject of a special study. This study led to the adoption of an official policy statement in June 1986. That policy makes it the long-range goal of the Board to develop the resources necessary to provide all children access to FL study leading to "usable proficiency." The study, which defines "usable proficiency," and the policy statement are available from Mr. Griffith.

Among the implications of this policy are:

- FL instruction should begin in the early elementary years, continue in an uninterrupted sequence through high school, and lead to usable proficiency in the target language.
- All students should have access to second-language instruction, including limited-English populations.
- Less commonly taught languages should receive greater emphasis, and existing FL programs should be expanded.
- Global perspectives should be incorporated across the curriculum.

Because implementing the policy will place heavy demands on limited staff and material resources, Mr. Griffith feels that CAI might well provide part of the solution. CAI should therefore be included as a regular component of teacher inservice and preservice.

Mr. Griffith reviewed the problems relating the perceptions of FL teachers regarding CAI: lack of awareness and confidence, "turf" issues, software perceived as inadequate, etc. A primary cause of teacher dissatisfaction is unreasonable expectations: some teachers seem to expect to be able to "plug their students into the machine" and leave them on their own. We might remedy the problem of unreasonable teacher expectations by a combination of two approaches: educating teachers so that their expectations regarding CAI are more reasonable, and encouraging commercial developers to produce software that corresponds more closely to teachers' expectations.

Mr. Griffith emphasized that the State Board does not normally provide direct services to local schools. The Board's emphasis is on program development, training, and awareness development, pursuant to the implementation of policy and legislation. Activities are often conducted in cooperation with professional organizations, local school districts, and institutions of higher education.

Mention was made of various Board-sponsored events scheduled for 1987-88:

- Annual Second Language and International Studies Conference (October 2-3, Sangamon State University), in cooperation with the Illinois Foreign Language Leadership Council. LLL has participated in the past and is invited to participate again.
- Globalfest '88, an annual celebration for students of language and international studies (March 4-5, University High School, Normal), in cooperation with ISU Laboratory

Schools. Approximately 1500 teachers and students K-12 will be involved. LLL is invited to contribute a booth or a discovery room.

- Third International Conference on Second/Foreign Language Acquisition by Children (March 18-19, Bismarck Hotel, Chicago), in cooperation with the National SLAC Committee. LLL is invited to respond to the call for presentations.

Calls for presentations/papers for all the above are available from Mr. Griffith.

Other developments affecting FL education in Illinois were mentioned:

- Certification testing for new teachers will be implemented in June 1988, pursuant to legislation passed in 1985. Modern language candidates will be required to pass both oral and written tests.

- The State Board and the Illinois Board of Higher Education have jointly developed draft learning outcome statements for college-bound high-school students in the areas of science, math, language arts, social studies, fine arts, and FL, to be considered for action by the IBHE later this year.

- Many ESCs have formed advisory committees for FL and some of them have already begun conducting inservice programs for FL teachers.

- The Board has included in the budget currently under consideration by the General Assembly two line items of special interest to FL educators: $500,000 for planning grants for new FL programs and $52,500 to provide scholarships for FL teacher training. As a result of Board action in March, such scholarships are already available under the teacher shortage program; but with increased funding, more scholarships can be provided.

**Sharon Pikul** asked **Paul Griffith** about the status of other FL bills she had seen listed. Mr. Griffith said that there had been five bills, which the sponsors combined into one bill, which had in turn been assigned to interim study by the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee. This action will allow the proposed legislation to be brought up again as early as January 1988.

**Dean Larson** mentioned $460,000 in funds for projects for which the contracts are already being let. He distributed the following additional documents:

- The front page of the Sept./Oct. (1986) issue of *School Tech News*, featuring FL CAI in California;

- An MLA announcement of *Nota Bene*, a word processor which handles foreign accents well;

- The February (1987) Chambers & Wiley *Technology & Text Letter*, featuring *Enable*;

- The FL portion of the Queue catalogue.

**Dick Dennis** raised the question of whether teachers felt under pressure to use technology. **Dean Larson** was of the opinion that they view it as a tool: if it is appropriate, then fine. But if it does not prove helpful, they do not feel obligated to use it. The Libertyville school district is not engaged in a "computer crusade"; they have not even had a program to encourage computer literacy among teachers. Mr. Larson mentioned an eight-factor profile he had found helpful in establishing the exact posture of each teacher relative to educational technology. **Ernesto Garcia** agreed that there is no overt coercion to use computers in Libertyville. What pressure exists arises from the performance of students using CAI: especially improvement in composition skills and grammar. **Mark Myers** cited UCLA research showing that a multi-modality approach to education is very appropriate and beneficial. **Sam Ritchie** agreed that computer usage is not viewed as required, but is at the teacher's discretion. However, there is some pressure from the *students* to use computers. **Dick Dennis** concluded that we appeared to be outgrowing the period when teachers felt guilty if they did not take advantage of new technologies. **Sam Ritchie** concurred that guilt was not an issue in teacher's decisions to use computers or not.

**Mark Myers** emphasized that he is quite content if teachers reject the use of CAI after exploring its possibilities, but that he is bothered by those who blindly reject new technologies; he calls them "inhibitors". To succeed, CAI must solve problems that teachers *have*. It is important not to let technologists control the curriculum.

**Kay Hicks** remarked that, in order to create some excitement in the field, FL CAI need some irreplaceably valuable piece of courseware, such as *Oregon Trails* was for language arts, to serve as an impetus to districts to buy equipment, etc. There really is nothing available in FL CAI that teachers can point to and say: "This is better than anything I can do in any other way."

**Dean Larson** noted that the focus in the field was previously on programming, and that it was time for a change in perspective. Unless you have successful pilot programs, you will not be able to achieve any long-term gains. He also noted that it is important to manage staff resources carefully; he cited the example of the Micro-Ideas Conference, where he had assigned each staff member to attend particular presentations to ensure that no valuable information would inadvertently be missed. **Kay Hicks** remarked that next year's conference will be held on February 24.

**Mark Myers** emphasized the importance of training teachers in the correct use of commercial software, in order to avoid its misuse.

**Patty Webb** observed that life is harder for teachers in small school districts, which do not have access to large corporate grants. Teachers also may face resistance from short-sighted administrators. Not only is little money likely to be available for FL CAI in such districts, but a teacher's own efforts to raise funds may be hampered; Ms. Webb has been refused permission to sell candy in order to raise money for CAI purchases.

**Sharon Pikul** remarked on budgetary problems at the state level. She also noted that computer-laboratory usage is sometimes complicated by constraints stemming from conditions on grants used to purchase the equipment originally. For instance, if a laboratory paid for with grant money earmarked for science and mathematics is used for FL instruction, the district is in violation of state law. The solution is to LOBBY hard for FL.

**C. C. Cheng** asked what the impact would be if, say, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences began requiring two years of high-school FL for admission. **Sharon Pikul** said that some school districts would not be able to provide course offerings that would permit students to meet the requirement. She observed that the majority of the state is rural; small school districts have trouble paying for extra staff in areas like FL.

**Paul Griffith** mentioned a pilot program which has been implemented in Carroll County. There is a two-way television link-up which permits one Spanish teacher to teach students in four remote sites. They can see her and she can see them. Innovative approaches like this might allow rural districts to offer FL even if they do not have enough interested students to fill a class.

**Sharon Pikul**, who works with a committee for rural and small schools, said she is familiar with the Carroll County pilot project. However, that project was accorded a special exemption from normal state regulations regarding how classes are supervised. Unless the legislature can be convinced to extend such exemptions to other districts (against undoubted pressure from teachers' unions), other districts cannot implement a similar plan.

**Dean Larson** suggested that small districts can sometimes achieve higher efficiency in utilization of equipment. For instance, Libertyville has an 85% efficiency rating (65% is considered very good). There will always be nay-sayers. While possible solutions may not represent the ideal situation, with cooperation and a will to succeed, some way can always be found. Small districts may also enjoy the benefit of avoiding problems associated with a large bureaucracy: there is less chance of conflicts and politicking between administrators if there are fewer administrators.

**Sue Arbuckle** suggested that teacher inservice training be done on a release-time basis. It is too hard for many teachers to arrange their schedules to attend a course after school or on non-school day. **Dean Larson** suggested budgeting money at the beginning of the year to provide release time for subject-area meetings, but not scheduling the meetings themselves until the teachers perceived a need.

**Paul Griffith** mentioned an example of an opportunity offered by the French Cultural Services. American teachers of French can receive five days of inservice programs subsidized by the French government, to be followed by a scholarship for a ten-day summer institute in France. One problem is that few teachers can manage the five days out of the classroom to attend the initial days of inservice. Mr. Griffith emphasized that this was just one example of many opportunities that could be made available if conditions were conducive.

**Mark Myers** cited research indicating that teachers made some 5000 decisions a day. He made the suggestion that gains could be made in staff development with no additional cost in time to teachers if principals changed their approach to staff management and development. Trivial management details could be handled by memo, etc. Then the time in faculty meetings usually dedicated to "administration" could be turned into staff-development time. This approach might avoid hassles with the teachers' unions as well. What is essential is that all parties involved recognize the value of staff development so that both are willing to cooperate and give a little: a little release time and mileage on the district's part, some uncompensated time from the teachers, and personnel and other resources from the training institution. It is crucial, however, that the decision-making process remain with the teacher. Technology does not supplant a teacher.

At 2:20 p.m. the conference participants moved to the microcomputer laboratory to view demonstrations of various LLL projects involving CAI directly or indirectly. The projects demonstrated were as follows:

- *Written French*'s restaurant sequence (demonstrated by its designer, **Fernand Marty**) on PLATO, programmed in TUTOR.

- *Korean Lesson 1* (demonstrated by its programmer, **Fred Steinberg**), using the EIS Instavox random-access audio device, interfaced with an IBM PC, programmed in TenCORE (TUTOR clone).

- *Swahili Lesson 4* (demonstrated by its assembler, **Rick Treece**) from the African Languages Project, also using the EIS audio device, also programmed in TenCORE.

- *French Vocabulary*, a portion of our interactive video prototype materials (demonstrated by the micro laboratory coordinator **Steve Helmreich**), designed by **Susan Campanini** and **Robert Hart**, programmed in TenCORE by **Ulric Chung**.

- *French Text-to-Speech* (designed by **Fernand Marty**), capable of creating phonemic output from sentences typed in standard orthography, programmed in TURBO PASCAL on an IBM XT.

- *Mots de la même famille*, programmed in EnBASIC on an Apple IIe by one of our Summer Institute participants.

The conference reconvened in Lucy Ellis Lounge for the closing session.

**Paul Griffith** mentioned a technological resource he discovered on a recent twelve-day visit to France. American students can correspond with French counterparts using France's Minitel system, which is part of the French telephone system. The goal is to provide a terminal for every telephone in France by the end of 1988; users can use the terminals to make purchases, bank, pay bills, etc. Americans can gain access to the system through Intel. This project is a joint effort by the French Cultural Service and the Illinois State Board of Education. **Sharon Pikul** asked if interested parties should contact Paul Griffith directly for details. He replied that they should. He added that the correspondence could take many forms, depending on the age and language-abilities of the participants, ranging from simple pen-pal activities to, say, the cooperative authorship of a mystery. Knowledge of French is desirable, but not crucial, as French students study English. In any case, the first contact should be administrative. From the French standpoint, they stand to get a lot of response for their effort, in that they can send the same message to participating classes in various countries. **C. C. Cheng** noted that access is available through the BITNET system at the University of Illinois.

**Arlene Bloom** asked about the expense involved. **Paul Griffith** said that it should not be great. **Louise Bassett** observed that it would at least involve equipment purchase. Paul Griffith agreed that it would. **Dick Dennis** estimated that expenses relating to access to a clearing-house service and subscription costs would only run two to three dollars a month.

**Jim Wiedman** asked **Paul Griffith** if he is the official in charge of this project for Illinois. Paul Griffith replied that he is. **Arlene Bloom** asked about problems relating to the difference in time

zones. Paul Griffith said that for Europe this is not much of an issue since of the countries of Western Europe are mostly on the same time zone. In any case, the computer has its own memory. From America, you would assemble your transmission and then send it all at once quickly; in this way, you could keep the telephone charges at a minimum. Minitel contacts have already led to exchanges of realia, tapes, and even personnel.

**Sharon Pikul** asked what procedure is used to market LLL software. **C. C. Cheng** said that he is still negotiating those details with the University. Essentially, the LLL sells the materials; authors may eventually see a tiny royalty.

**Dick Dennis** asked about the production of language tapes for student use outside of LLL facilities. He wondered specifically if the LLL could handle the volume and logistics involved in producing tapes for use outside the University community. **C. C. Cheng** said that the main problem would be with copyright restrictions. The LLL would have to contact publishers to get permission to duplicate tapes for extramural use. He noted that the LLL also gets many inquiries regarding video tapes. He would like to see the LLL be able to honor such requests as part of its service function.

**Mark Myers** asked if the LLL ever serves as a consulting service, say for a district that wanted to set up its own telephone-tape service, on a smaller scale than the LLL's. **C. C. Cheng** answered that normally the LLL would be glad to. At the moment, because of the change from AT&T equipment to the University's own telephone system, the LLL is having trouble with its own telephone-tape machines.

**Kay Hicks** asked if the LLL would provide consulting services for ESCs. **Mark Myers** suggested that the ESCs could coordinate consulting services between the LLL and local districts. **C. C. Cheng** said the LLL was glad to serve as a consultant, and frequently did so for other universities as well, recently, for instance, one in Florida.

**Sue Arbuckle** asked for more details about last summer's CALLIOPE institute. **C. C. Cheng** referred her to a descriptive document included in the conference packet. **Robert Hart** mentioned that about twenty teachers attended two 4-week sessions. Anonymous evaluations done by the participants were favorable, and the staff was pleased with the quality of the participants as well. C. C. Cheng expanded upon the material contained in the document in the conference packet by describing somewhat the selection process. This year we selected twenty candidates from among nearly thirty applicants. Applicants are required to submit a *Curriculum Vitae*, a proposal for a project, and an endorsement from a school administrator.

**C. C. Cheng** asked the group whether they felt the endorsement by a school administrator was worthwhile. **Paul Griffith** thought that it was worthwhile if only in that it kept the administrator aware. If CALLIOPE could glean any useful information from it, so much the better.

**Sharon Pikul** said that the CALLIOPE Summer Institute brochure failed to make some details clear. Was enrollment limited to the twenty scholarship recipients? There was no price listed on the brochure. Ms. Pikul suggested that some teachers might be willing to pay to attend the Institute if not selected as a scholarship recipient. C. C. Cheng said that twenty participants was just about the limit of the staff's ability to provide high-quality, personalized instruction.

**Sharon Pikul** said she now understood that no price was listed because there was no cost to those accepted; however, this fact was not clear from the brochure. Perhaps it could be revised for next year. Ms. Pikul raised the possibility of sponsoring another (perhaps shorter) session for which participants would be expected to pay. Dick Dennis stated that there were many precedents for such a course. Robert Hart raised the possibility of holding such a course in the summer or during the school year in one of the ESC regions. Paul Griffith assured him that appropriate sites do exist. Dean Larson concurred, and provided, by way of example, a listing of computer equipment available in Libertyville.

**Mark Myers** said that many of the ESCs would probably be interested in helping to facilitate a regional institute or course. **Paul Griffith** asked if there would be enough interest on the teachers' part. **Sharon Pikul** said the ESCs could create the interest. She recalled that earlier elementary FL programs had died because of lack of interest, lack of support, and lack of good materials. With proper support from the State Board of Education and the legislature in Springfield, the outcome could be very different. **Mark Myers** remarked that "scholarship" funds are harder to find for "non-mandated" programs like FL; he asked if free academic credit could be used as an enticement. **C. C. Cheng** said he thought free credit would be no problem, but **Dick Dennis** reported that the University seems less willing to accord free credit than previously: it would have to be negotiated with the administration. (Credit can be offered easily for courses that charge extramural tuition, a rate about half the cost of a course offered on campus.)

**Paul Griffith** said that those who wanted to know more about State Board of Education activities could read the policy studies. **Sharon Pikul** wondered aloud how many of the ESC directors read them.

**Dean Larson** encouraged everyone to go home and stimulate a lot of interest so that a whole sequence of courses could be developed. **Louise Bassett** suggested the French-American link-up as a good way to create some new interest; she asked **Paul Griffith** how the technological details would work. He said that when he saw the interest, he would arrange meetings with the proper people. Ms. Bassett said that the interest would definitely be there.

**Kay Hicks** extended an invitation to the State Board Conference at Sangamon State. She expressed approval of the concept and execution of the day's roundtable conference and suggested that another one should be held at some future time. **C. C. Cheng** asked if the fall would be a good time. **Sam Ritchie** suggested that such a conference might be held in conjunction with some other meeting where most of the participants would already be expected to be in attendance, for instance the next ICE meeting, in October at the Math and Science Academy.

**Christa Garcia** said next year's convention of the IFLTA, now fifty-nine years old, will be held in Peoria, October 29-31, 1987.

She made the point that it was not necessarily good to lump bilingual and ESL programs with FL in policy studies and legislation. There is enough confusion of bilingual with FL in the public's mind already without our contributing further to it. FL education in Illinois has a long and respectable tradition of its own.

**Cathy Gunn** suggested that mailings be sent not only to directors of ESCs (or administrators), on the assumption that they will circulate them, but also the technology specialists (or interested

teachers) directly. **Dean Larson** agreed; it is also important for superintendents to receive mailings so that they can keep informed.

**Sam Ritchie** asked about listings of available FL courseware. **Mark Myers** mentioned on-line software evaluations on the PLATO system, available through the PLATO terminals of the ESCs. **Christa Garcia** added that the Northeast Conference in Connecticut publishes something.

**C. C. Cheng** expressed regret that the time had been so short. He thanked the participants for coming and for sharing their thoughts. The conference adjourned at 3:15 p.m.